DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 284 FL 026 289

AUTHOR Kang, Dong-Ho
TITLE Motivation and Foreign Language Learning in Korean EFL Context.
PUB DATE 2000-00-00
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Factor Analysis; Foreign Countries; Grade 9; Incentives; Korean; *Learning Motivation; Middle School Students; Middle Schools; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Self Esteem; Self Motivation; Sex Differences; Student Attitudes; *Student Motivation
IDENTIFIERS *South Korea

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that understanding the source and development of student motivation for learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) is very important for educational purposes. The purpose of this study of 234 Korean 9th graders was to identify the following: (1) Korean students' orientations and motivations for learning English; (2) what kinds of orientations could lead to motivations; (3) how new cognitive variables, such as confidence and attributions, are related to students' motivations; and (4) how gender relates to and affects student motivation. Methodologies employed included factor analysis to extract underlying motivations, Pearson product-moment correlations to assess relationships among these factors, and discriminate function analysis to examine the effects of gender. The following findings are discussed: integrative reasons for second language learning are most significant; goal salience, attributions, and self-confidence are the main motivators; all orientations should be internally controllable by students before leading to motivations; and females consistently report higher integrative orientations and more positive attitudes toward second language learning. It is concluded that formal, extrinsic, classroom-related motivations were more important factors in second language learning than traditional integrative and instrumental motivations in Korean EFL contexts. Extensive quantitative empirical data and 64 references are included. (Author/KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 284

Motivation and Foreign Language Learning in Korean EFL Context

Abstract

Kang, Dong-Ho

Understanding the source of motivation and the development of motivation for learning English as a foreign language is very important for educational purposes. Without motivated students to study English, it was hard to teach them. Therefore, the purpose of this study of 234 students was to identify (1) Korean students' orientations and motivations for learning English; (2) What kinds of orientations could lead to motivations; (3) how new cognitive variables, such as self-confidence and attributions, are related to students' motivations; and (4) how gender is related to students' motivation. The L2 motivation data were factor-analyzed to extract underlying motivation factors. Pearson product moment correlations were used to assess the relationships among the motivation factors. Discriminant Function analysis was used to examine the effects of gender on the motivations. The results indicate (1) that integrative reasons for L2 learning were the most significant; (2) extrinsic motivations, combined with cognitive constructs, i.e., goal salience, attributions, and self confidence, were mainly involved with L2 motivations; (3) all orientations should be internally controllable by for students before leading to motivations; and (4) females consistently reported higher integrative orientation and more positive attitudes toward learning situations than males. In conclusion, formal classroom related motivations, i.e., extrinsic motivation, were more involved with foreign language learning, rather than traditional integrative/instrumental motivation, in Korean EFL contexts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Kang

I. Introduction

There has been growing interest in the area of second language learning motivation in the past few decades. Gardner and his colleagues have done a good deal of research examining motivations for language learning using a socio-psychological framework, which they entitled the "socio-educational model" (Gardner & Lambert, 1959, 1972; Gardner, 1985b; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1992, 1993b). Socio-psychologists such as Gardner and Lambert proposed that the second language learner's attitudes towards the linguistic-cultural community of the target language, which they call "integrative orientation," influence success in second language learning indirectly through motivation. In other words, integratively-motivated learners tend to succeed in the second language achievement. This has been labeled the "integrative motive hypothesis" in Crookes and Schmidt (1991). Several themes and questions emerged from this body of research.

Recent researchers have questioned whether the socio-educational model could be generalized to different contexts, in particular foreign language learning settings (Schmidt et al., 1996; Dornyei, 1990, 1994a; Clement et al., 1994; Kraemer, 1993; Oxford & Shearin, 1994, 1996). Because the socio-educational model was developed in ESL or bilingual situations (especially in Canada), where students could use the second language outside the classroom, the model focused on the social dimension of L2 motivation, that is, "integrative orientation." Recent researchers claimed that foreign language learning (EFL) orientations, in settings where most learning of English takes place in the formal classroom, might consist of sub-components of Gardner's traditional integrative/instrumental orientations as well as intrinsic/extrinsic orientations, depending on the contexts (Dornyei, 1990; Clement et al., 1994; Julkunen, 1989; Schmidt et al., 1996). Even though Gardner claimed that "the source of the motivating impetus is relatively unimportant, provided that motivation is aroused" (1985b, p.169), the source of motivation, that is, orientation, is very important for foreign language educators in the formal classroom, in particular in Korea (Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

Furthermore, current researchers are concerned about the question of whether Gardner's conceptualization of "motivation"[1] is restricted to the integrative motive or whether there could be other motives in foreign language learning (Dornyei, 1994b; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). Deci and Ryan (1985) defined "intrinsic motivation" as "an activity when a person does the activity in the absence of a reward contingency or control," while "extrinsic motivation" refers to "behavior where the reason for doing it is something other than an interest in the activity itself" (pp. 34-35). More specifically, Harter (1981) operationally defined intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation poles toward learning and mastery in the classroom in the five separate dimensions: (a)preference for challenging work versus preference for easy work ; (b)curiosity/interest versus teacher approval; and (c) internal versus external criteria for success/failure. These dimensions were further divided into two

1 The researcher distinguished "orientation" and "motivation" to avoid the ambiguity, following Oxford & Shearin (1994). If the orientation might be related to motivated behavior, the researcher will use the term, "motivation," like "integrative motivation" as in Gardner (1985b). Otherwise, "orientation is used to refer to the reasons to study L2.

major factors. Higher order factoring revealed that the first two dimensions were interpreted as more motivational in nature, while the remaining one was viewed as more cognitive-informational in nature (Harter, 1981, p. 306). Furthermore, the first two dimensions, motivational sub-scales, were related to students' perceived competence, e.g., the higher one's perceived competence, the more intrinsic one's orientation. The question is whether other orientations could lead to motivations in the formal classroom, other than integrative motivation. Therefore, we need to identify what kinds of orientations could lead to motivations and further achievement in the formal classroom.

On the other hand, Dornyei (1994a) argued that Gardner's socio-educational model was based on motivational components grounded in the broader social milieu rather than in the foreign language classroom, and hence it did not include details on cognitive aspects of motivation to learn. In foreign language contexts, where most language learning takes place in the formal classroom, rather than in the social milieu, internal/individual or cognitive/affective aspects of motivation might be more important (Schmidt et al., 1996; Dornyei, 1996). Current researchers claimed that motivation theory from (general) psychology rather than Gardner's socio-psychological model could explain the complexity of second/foreign language learning motivation (Crookes & Schmidt, 1991; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Dornyei, 1994a). Several recent researchers found new cognitive and affective variables in the foreign language learning motivation (Dornyei, 1990a; Clement et al., 1994; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Schmidt et al., 1996). Language learning motivation can be influenced by need for achievement (Dornyei, 1990a), students' self-efficacy or self-confidence (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Clement et al., 1994), attributions of "locus of control" or "stability": ability, luck, effort, and task difficulty in Weiner (1985, 1986), and goal setting (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). This current research indicated that motivation was not due to a single construct like Gardner's "integrative motive" factor, but a multi-factor construct which was composed of several sub-components, depending on the language learning contexts (Bardwell & Braaksma, 1983; Schmidt et al., 1996).

First, one possible predictor of motivation was concerned with attributions of success and failure in the foreign language learning contexts (Weiner, 1979, 1985, 1986; Weiner et al., 1971; Schunk, 1991; Keller, 1983). Attribution theory views as fundamental the way people attribute causes to events, and suggest that people vary in the way they do this (Skehan, 1989). Weiner (1985) proposed that causal attributions of success/failure can be explained in terms of three dimensions: locus of control, stability, and controllability. The locus of control was concerned with whether the result of action is within the person or within the environment (p. 551). That is, people's motivated behaviors depend on whether a person believes that outcomes occur independently of how he or she acts (external) or outcomes are likely to result from personal efforts (internal) (Schunk, 1991, p. 209). A second dimension of causality, stability, refers to whether causal attributions are stable or unstable. The third dimension of causality, controllability, was concerned with whether the causal attributions are controllable or not (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

Dornyei (1990a) also claimed that attributions about past failure could be expected to affect motivation, because in foreign language learning contexts "learning failure" was a very common phenomenon. Dornyei's study also identified a "need for achievement" factor (related to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"determination") (Atkinson & Raynor, 1974) and Julkunen's study found a factor of "helplessness" (the opposite of expectations for success). Therefore, both "bad learning experiences" and "helplessness" seemed to be related to "beliefs about failure" and maladaptive attributions. These two factors are likely to appear more frequently in the foreign language learning contexts than the second language contexts.

On the other hand, the attributions might have motivational properties based upon their influence on expectancy (Weiner, 1986, 1992; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Weiner (1985) suggested that expectancy and affect direct motivated behaviors. Clement et al. (1994) included "self-confidence" in their research. In the language learning literature, expectancy and self-efficacy was very similar to self-confidence (Clement & Kruidenier, 1985; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Self-confidence was a little different from self-efficacy in Clement (1980) in that it involved both "a low anxious affect and high self-perceptions of L2 competence" (Clement et al., 1994, p. 422). Clement and Kruidenier (1985) proposed that self-confidence was the most important determinant of motivation to learn and use the L2 in a multi-cultural setting, in particular, in Canada (Clement, 1980). The replication to EFL setting showed that self-confidence also influenced L2 proficiency in Clement et al.'s study.

Other research indicates that gender might be related to students' second language learning motivation (Green & Oxford, 1995; MacIntyre, 1994a). Many researchers argued that females' orientations are likely to be manifested in sex-appropriate areas, particularly social skills (Stein & Bailey, 1973; Nyikos, 1990; Maccobby & Jacklin, 1974; Oxford, 1993a). A few researchers in the socio-educational model showed that females have more favorable attitudes toward learning a second language and are more motivated than males (Muchnick & Wolfe, 1982; Burstall, 1975). Research by Schmidt et al. (1996) also identified a gender difference in goal orientations. These findings indicated that gender differences in motivation appear in sex-appropriate activities, i.e., social skills, and some types of motivation might be related to gender.

The present study requires a study with foreign language learners, in particular, school populations, considering all possible variables such as orientations, several cognitive/affective variables, motivations, and students' achievement. The question is whether other orientations than integrative/instrumental ones could lead to motivations in the formal classroom, and further what kinds of new cognitive constructs are involved with the connections between orientations and motivations. Therefore, we need to identify what kinds of orientations could lead to motivations and further achievement in the formal classroom.

II. Research Method

Two hundred thirty four Korean 9th grade middle school students learning English as a foreign language (113 male and 121 female students) in Korea participated in this study in 1997. The researcher investigated their EFL motivation by using a questionnaire (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Clement et al., 1994; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; see Kang, 1999). The data in the middle school year (1997) were factor-analyzed to extract underlying factors of EFL students' orientations and motivations. Pearson product-moment correlations were used to assess the relationships between orientations and motivational factors. Before conducting the main study, students were told research information and asked to sign a human-subject consent form at the beginning of October 1997. Students were also told that the information in this study would be kept confidential and they were encouraged to complete the questionnaires candidly. In addition because some of the questions asked their opinions of teaching methods, the researcher conducted the survey. In this way, the presence of English teachers on the students' responses was minimized.

All instruments except the new cognitive constructs were adapted from AMTB (Attitude/Motivation Test Battery), which Gardner (1985a) developed to assess the affective variables. Many current researchers in L2 also revised the original instrument, depending on the specific contexts, in particular EFL (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Dornyei, 1990a; Clement et al., 1994). As far as the reliability was concerned, AMTB showed significantly high internal consistency and test/retest reliability coefficients. Gardner and his associates reported median internal consistency estimates of .70 (but .91 and .89 in the earlier research) and median one year test/retest reliability of .61 (Gardner, 1985a; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a). In addition numerous research has reported the validity of AMTB, i.e., predictive validity (the significant correlations between integrative motive and achievement) (e.g., Clement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977; Gardner & Smythe, 1975, 1981; Gliskman, 1981; Lalonde, 1982 cited in Gardner, 1985a), and construct validity (see Gardner, 1985a; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993a; Gardner & Tremblay, 1994b).

On the other hand, intrinsic/extrinsic orientation scales were developed by Harter (1981). The reliability estimate of .78 was reported for the index of internal consistency and a six month test/retest reliability coefficients ranged from .58 to .76 (see Harter, 1981). Harter (1981) also reported the validity of this scale by using factor analysis. This scale was also tested by Julkunen (1989) in an EFL context. The "need for achievement" scale was used by Dornyei (1990a) and Clement et al. (1994). Even though they did not report specific reliability coefficients, the factor analysis used by them could be the evidence of the validity of this scale.

The new cognitive constructs, Persistence and Attention scales, were developed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995). They reported high internal consistency coefficients, i.e., .76 and .81 respectively. In addition the confirmatory factor analysis evidenced the construct validity of these scales. Tremblay and Gardner also adapted causal attribution scales from the Multidimensional-Multiattributional Causality Scales to assess the causal attributions of success and failure to ability, effort, context, and luck (Lefcourt, 1981; Lefcourt et al., 1979, cited in Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). The indices of internal consistency ranged from .26 to .71 for eight scales, e.g. ability-success, ability-failure, and so on. Finally, Goal Salience scale was developed by Tremblay

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and Gardner (1995). The internal consistency coefficients of two scales, goal specificity and goal frequency, were significantly high: .72 and .75 respectively.

The scales were administered in Korean. Responses on the negatively worded items were recorded before scoring. The number of items and internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach's Index of Internal Consistency) obtained with the Korean school population were presented in brackets along with scale descriptions (Kang, 1999).

1. Orientations (45 items): Orientations were adapted from scales used in previous studies of second language learning (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983; Clement et al., 1994; Harter, 1981). This scale was used to assess students' reasons for learning English.

2. Attitudes toward Americans was adapted from the scale used by Clement et al. (1994) and AMTB (5 items, .7953). This scale evaluated the extent to which the students feel positively toward American citizens.

3. Attitudes toward learning English was adapted from AMTB and Tremblay and Gardner (1995) (5 items, .7253). This scale was used to assess the students' affective reaction toward learning the second language.

4. Need for Achievement was adapted from Clement et al. (1994) (4 items, .5512). The scale assessed the extent to which the students desire to achieve in the second language.

5. Motivational Intensity was adapted from Clement et al. (1994) (4 items, .7453). This scale was used to determine the degree of effort the student exerted when learning English.

6. Students' attitudes toward learning situations: Two scales, English teacher evaluation (12 items, .8236) and English course evaluation (7 items, .7204), were adapted from Clement et al. (1994).

7. Self-confidence/self-efficacy: The following three scales, English Use Anxiety (4 items, .7682) and English Class Anxiety (5 items, .8853), and self-evaluation of English competence (4 items, .7029)/Desired English Proficiency (1 item), were adopted from Clement et al. (1994) to assess students' self-efficacy or self-confidence.

8. Causal Attributions: Multidimensional-Multiattributional Causality Scales were adopted from Tremblay and Gardner (1995) to assess causal attributions of success/failure in L2 to ability, effort, context, and luck: ability-success (.5475), ability-failure (.5953), effort-success (.8619), effort-failure (.7253), context-success (.5286), context-failure (.8153), luck-success (.6204), luck-failure (.7914).

9. Goal Salience Scale: Two scales, goal specificity (8 items, .7538) and goal frequency (8 items, .8334), were adapted from Tremblay and Gardner in this study.

10. Desire to learn English (10 items, .2590): This scale was adapted from "Desire to learn French" (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995).

11. Persistence (10 items, .7902) and attention (10 items, .6653) were adopted from Tremblay and Gardner (1995).

12. Achievement Measures: The English teachers in Korea provided the students' English scores from the Spring semester in 1997. The histogram showed that the mean score of English scores was 48.3.

III. Result

1. Korean EFL students' Orientations

The researcher factor-analyzed the orientation items. Maximum likelihood method with oblim rotation was performed through SPSS 8.0 on 45 items from the orientations for a sample of 234 middle school students, to be consistent with previous research (Clement et al., 1994). The maximum number of factors (eigenvalues-longer than 1) was 13. However, retention of 13 factors seemed unreasonable so sharp breaks in size of eigenvalues were sought using the scree test (Cattell, 1966). Eigenvalues for the first five factors (variance explained) were all larger than first two and after the first five factors, changes in successive eigenvalues were small. In addition there were a few items with factor loadings of more than 1.00. Following Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), the researcher reduced the number of factors to 5. Five factor solution accounted for 44.380% of the variance. This factor solution was reasonable in considering previous research (Clement et al., 1994; Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989; Schmidt et al., 1996). With a cut of .30 of inclusion of a variable in interpretation of a factor, each factor was labeled as follows:

<Table 1- Factor Loadings of Orientations>

	Loadings
Factor 1: Integrative orientation	
-to know new people from different parts	.703
-to meet foreigners with whom I can speak English	.657
-to make friends with foreigners	.598
-to know the life of English-speaking nations	.587
-to know what's happening in the world	.549
-to understand English pop-music	.526
-to understand Eng-speaking nations' behav & probl	.498
-to know various cultures & people	.498
-to travel to countries where English is used	.489
-to learn more about English world.	.468
-to understand Eng-speaking films, videos, and so on	.435
Factor 2: Identification	
-in order to be similar to Americans	.800
-to think and behave like the English/Americans do	.708
-to take the country language exams in English	.319
Factor 3: Motivational Extrinsic orientation	
-work hard to get good grades	.631
-know when I have made mistakes without checking with the teacher	-.627
-I do extra projects so I can get better grades	.604
-read things because I am interested in English	-.602
-ask questions to learn new things	-.522
-I know whether or not I am doing well without grades	-.502
-I like difficult problems	-.496
-I like hard work	-.494
-work on problem to learn how to solve	-.458
-like to go on to work at more difficult level.	-.457
-need to get my report card to tell how I am doing	.406
Factor 4: Cognitive Extrinsic (External Criteria for success/failure)	
-not sure if I have done well on English until I get my papers back	.562
-do my English work because the teacher tells me to	.525
-like school subjects where it's easy to learn	.463
-not sure if my work in English is good or until the teacher tells me.	.451
-I would rather just learn what I have to in school	.389
-don't like difficult work	.367
-I know I didn't do my best when I turn it in.	-.367
Factor 5: Knowledge orientation	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

-broaden my outlook	.686
-a more knowledgeable person	.628
-educated person supposed to be able to speak	.535
-learn as many foreign languages as possible	.523
-be expected of me	.472
-need it for job/studies	.435
-help when traveling	.435
-without English, won't be able to travel	.408
-to spend some time abroad	.371
-without it, not be successful in any field	.336

Factor 1 received significant loadings from friendship, socio-cultural, integrative and travel orientation items from Clement and Kruidenier (1983). All items were related to an interest in target culture and society. These items were associated with Gardner's traditional integrative orientation (Gardner, 1985b). It seems that this factor consists of the sub-components of Gardner's (1985b) traditional integrative orientation factor, which current researchers found in terms of culture and contexts, that is, the distinctions between ESL and EFL (Dornyei, 1990a; Clement et al., 1994), or in terms of ethnicity (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983). Friendship orientation items (first three items) were the most influential among these sub-components. However, there was no distinction among the sub-components of traditional integrative orientation with Korean middle school students. Therefore, this factor was labeled as "integrative orientation," following Gardner's (1985b).

Factor 2 received significant loadings from the first two items, which were similar to the identification orientation factor in Clement et al. (1994), while the last item was related to instrumental orientation (Dornyei, 1990a; Clement et al., 1994). Because the last item was not significantly loaded on this factor, this factor was mainly concerned about Clement et al.'s (1994) identification factor. This factor was, therefore, labeled as "identification orientation."

Factor 3 received loadings from extrinsic orientation items (Harter, 1981). However, most of the items were concerned with preference for easy work and teacher approval, which Harter (1981) viewed as motivational in nature. Harter (1981) suggested that there are two kinds of orientations, that is, motivational and cognitive-informational ones. She found five categories on an intrinsic/extrinsic continuum: i.e., preference for challenging work vs. preference for easy work, curiosity/interests vs. teacher approval, and internal/external criteria for success/failure in the above factor loadings. The first two categories, challenge and curiosity, are basically related to motivational sub-scales, while the other ones, internal/external criteria for success/failure, to cognitive-informational sub-scales.

For example, most items were concerned about preference for easy work and teacher approval except the second, the sixth, and last items. All items which were negatively loaded on this factor consist of intrinsic orientation items, while items with positive loadings to this factor were related to extrinsic orientation (Harter, 1981). For example, the first and third items were related to language learning for school grades, that is, extrinsic orientation. On the other hand, the fourth and fifth items were associated with curiosity, while seventh and eighth items, with challenge. These items were intrinsic orientations, but negatively loaded on this factor. Even though there were only three items about external criteria for success/failure, all other items were related to motivational ones (Harter, 1981) (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval).

Overall, middle school students were more extrinsically oriented to study English (i.e., preference for easy work, seeking good grades, and so on) than intrinsically oriented, but most of these extrinsic orientations were related to a motivational sub-scales in nature, rather than the cognitive-informational sub-scales. This factor was, therefore, labeled as "motivational extrinsic orientation" factor.

Factor 4 was related to external criteria for success/failure (see Julkunen, 1989). For example, the first, second, and fourth items are related to external criteria such as school, teacher, and so on, rather than internal criteria. Even though two items were part of a challenge such as like easy work (third item) and don't like difficult work (sixth item), all other items focused on the cognitive-informational aspects, rather than motivational aspects, in the continuum of intrinsic/extrinsic orientations (Harter, 1981). Therefore, this factor was labeled as "cognitive extrinsic" orientation, following Julkunen (1989). Overall, both Factor 3 and 4 were related to extrinsic orientation, but the former (F3) was basically a more motivational aspect of extrinsic orientation, while the latter (F4) was mainly associated with cognitive-informational one of extrinsic orientation.

Factor 5 received significant loadings from knowledge, instrumental, and travel orientation items (Clement & Kruidenier, 1983). The first four items were related to knowledge orientation, the next two items, instrumental orientation, and the rest, were to travel orientation. It seems that knowledge orientation items are most significantly loaded on this factor with moderate loadings of instrumental and travel orientations. Korean middle school students seem to consider foreign language learning as one of the school subjects. Knowledge was accompanied with instrumental purposes in the foreign language learning contexts, as in Clement et al. (1994). The loadings of travel orientation on this factor were related to the use of English when traveling. Travel orientation was overlapped with instrumental purposes as in Dornyei (1990a). Instrumental and travel orientations were relatively weak with this population, compared with EFL high school population in Dornyei (1990a) and Clement et al. (1994). Instead, school-subject related knowledge orientation was strongly associated with this factor. Therefore, this factor was labeled as knowledge orientation.

2. Korean EFL students' Motivation

Secondly, the researcher factor analyzed both orientation factors extracted from the previous factor analysis above and motivation variables, using SPSS maximum-likelihood method with varimax rotation, to be consistent with previous research (Gardner, 1985b; Clement et al., 1994). The indices of motivation variables were calculated by standardizing and summing the composite of each construct, following previous research (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995; Clement et al., 1994). The initial factor solution extracted 10 factors with the criteria of eigenvalue, 1.00, but the 10 factor solution included the items with loadings of more than 1.00. The factor solution reduced to seven factors, following Tabachnick and Fidell (1996). The following seven-factor solution accounted for 53.494% of the variance.

<Table 2- Factor Loading of Motivations>

	Loadings
Factor 1: Motivation (Extrinsic)	
-persistence	.663
-attention	.643
-goal frequency	.576
-motivational intensity	.569
-goal specificity	.555
-attitudes toward learning English	.544
-need for achievement	.480
-English class anxiety	.464
-motivational extrinsic orientation	-.455
-English use anxiety	.437
-cognitive extrinsic orientation	.371
-self-evaluation (complex)	
Factor 2: Achievement	
-self-evaluation	.690
-desired proficiency	.542
-English score	.528
-Desire to study English	.444
Factor 3: Maladaptive attributions	
-attributions of success to luck	.689
-attributions of failure to luck	.591
-attributions of failure to context	.548
-attributions of failure to ability	.495
-identification (F2)	.332
Factor 4: Learning Environment/Teacher Evaluation	
-English teacher competence	.806
-English teacher rapport	.613
-English teacher motivation	.415
Factor 5: Adaptive attributions	
-attributions of success to effort	.633
-attributions of success to ability	.630
-attributions of failure to effort	.529
Factor 6: Orientation Indices	
-integrative orientation factor (F1)	.718
-knowledge-instrumental (F5)	.603
-goal specificity (complex variable)	.328
Factor 7: Learning Environment (Course evaluation)	
-English class attractiveness	.641
-English teacher style	.481
-English class difficulty	.386
-English class usefulness	.344

<Table 3- Factor Matrix of EFL Students' Motivations>

Label	Eigenvalue	Variance	Cumulative
Motivation	6.623	19.481	19.481
English Achievement	3.325	9.515	28.996
Maladaptive Attributions	2.634	7.746	36.742
Teacher Evaluation	1.673	4.920	41.662
Adaptive Attribution	1.476	4.342	46.004
Orientation Dimension	1.344	3.954	49.958
Course Evaluation	1.202	3.537	53.494

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These variables loaded on the first factor (F1) were similar to Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) "motivation" factor with the combination of the sub-components. Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) "motivation" construct was the extended version of the earlier socio-educational model (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993b) with the inclusion of new constructs such as goal saliency, valence, and motivated behavior. The above three variables, persistence, attention, and motivational intensity, loaded on Factor 1 were components of the motivated behavior factor, while two variables, goal frequency and goal specificity, the indicator variables of the goal salience in Tremblay and Gardner (1995). In addition, attitudes toward learning English, was a sub-component of the valence factor, with the variable, the desire to study English, loaded on Factor 2.

On the other hand, other interesting variables loaded on this factor were anxiety variables and self-evaluation variable, which might have appeared independently, as in the self-confidence factor in Clement et al. (1994). The self-confidence construct was similar to self-efficacy in Tremblay and Gardner (1995). The combinations of anxiety and self-evaluation moderately supported Clement's social context model (see Clement, 1980, 1986; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985). However, the self-evaluation was more strongly loaded on motivation factor 2, that is, achievement, even though this variable was moderately loaded on this factor (F1). This factor loading indicates that the self-confidence construct might not be salient in the foreign language classroom environment, at least with Korean middle school population, where there is little contact with foreigners.

However, Factor 1 was really different from Trembly and Gardner's (1995) motivation. Their motivation was basically the extension of the socio-educational model, in particular, integrative motivation, while the above F1 did not contain any attitude-based constructs such as attitudes toward Americans or integrative orientation. Instead, the extrinsic orientation factors were loaded on Factor 1 (Harter, 1981). However, motivational extrinsic orientation such as less challenge and less curiosity was negatively loaded on Factor 1, while cognitive extrinsic orientation (i.e., external criteria for success/failure), positively on this Factor 1. The reason might be due to the fact that Factor 1 was basically composed of cognitive-based motivation (i.e., goal saliency, valence, and self-efficacy), rather than traditional Gardner's (1985b) attitude-based one.

Korean middle school students were more likely to assign their motivational factors (F1) (i.e., motivational intensity, goal saliency, and so on) to foreign language learning, based on external criteria (i.e., teachers and school grades), rather than internal ones. Furthermore, the negative loading of motivational extrinsic orientation to this factor indicates that preference for easy work and teacher approval were negatively associated with Factor 1 (i.e., more efforts and goal saliency). In other words, challenge and curiosity were associated with motivation (F1). Therefore, students were extrinsically orientated to study English (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval), but this orientation negatively influenced motivation or vice versa.

In addition the factor loading of need for achievement to this factor (F1) was different from Tremblay and Gardner's (1995). Dornyei (1990a) suggested "need for achievement" to be an important aspect in foreign language learning contexts. These factor loadings such as extrinsic orientation (both motivational and cognitive) and need for achievement indicate that foreign language learning motivation was related to more formal classroom-oriented one, unlike Gardner's

socio-educational model in the second language learning. Overall, all variables were concerned about general cognitive motivation variables suggested by Tremblay and Gardner (1995). Therefore, this factor was labeled as a general "motivation" factor.

Factor 2 received significant loadings of English achievement with a moderate loading from "desire to study English." The first three variables, self-evaluation, desired proficiency, and English score, were related to students' achievement. Self-evaluation variable had cross loadings between Factor 1 and Factor 2. The factor matrix indicates that self-evaluation was more associated with achievement rather than with anxiety or self-confidence, unlike Clement et al.'s (1994) research with Hungarian EFL high school students. Therefore, self-evaluation might be more related to second language learning proficiency or achievement, as Au (1988) argued. Otherwise, a self-confidence construct might be related to frequency or quality of making contacts with foreigners in even foreign language learning contexts (Clement, 1980; Clement & Kruidenier, 1985; Clement, Gardner, & Smythe, 1977, 1980). Clement et al.'s(1994) research showed that high school students reported extracurricular contacts with foreigners, while Korean middle school population seldom made contacts with foreigners (Clement et al., 1994; Au, 1988). Whether self-evaluation was associated with self-confidence or achievement, all variables loaded on this factor were related to foreign language learning achievement. Therefore, this was labeled as "achievement" factor.

Factor 3 received significant loadings from attribution variables with moderate influence from the identification orientation factor. All these variables attributed their success or failure of foreign language learning to luck, context, or ability. This factor was similar to maladaptive attribution proposed by Tremblay and Gardner (1995), because students could not control these causality variables. This was also related to Dornyei's (1990a) attribution about past failure and Julkunen's (1989) "helplessness" factor. As Dornyei (1990a) pointed out, attributions about past failure might be much more salient in foreign language learning contexts than in second language learning contexts. Therefore, this factor explained relatively the high variance of motivation (Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989). This factor was, therefore, labeled as "maladaptive attribution" factor, following Tremblay and Gardner (1995).

Factor 4 received significant loadings from the evaluation of learning environment found in Gardner (1985b) and Clement et al. (1994). More specifically, Factor 4 was related to English teacher evaluation. All variables loaded on Factor 4 were concerned with the evaluation of English teacher rather than that of English course. The evaluation of the English teacher was one of the attitudes toward learning environment factors which were associated with integrativeness construct in the socio-educational model (Gardner, 1985b; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993). This factor also appeared independently in the foreign language learning contexts, as in Clement et al. (1994). Therefore, this was labeled as "the evaluation of the teacher" dimension.

Factor 5 received significant loadings from three attribution variables: i.e., efforts and ability. All variables were related to either internal causality or controllability, according to Weiner's (1985) attribution theory. In other words, these attributions were defined as either internal/external aspects of causalities or whether students can control or not. Tremblay and Gardner (1995) defined these attributions as "adaptive attributions" because students can control

these causalities, while Schmidt et al. (1996) described it in terms of internal vs. external attributions. However, Schmidt et al.'s (1996) internal attributions were overlapped with expectation of success and was labeled as "determination" factor. It seemed to be more reasonable to label this as "adaptive attributions," because Factor 5 was more homogeneous, compared with Schmidt et al.'s (1996).

Factor 6 received the high loadings from orientation factors found in the previous factor analysis with the moderate influence of goal specificity. All variables were related to language learning goals or reasons for studying English. This factor was similar to Clement et al.'s (1994) "orientation" dimension. This is, therefore, labeled as orientation dimension. Factor 7 received significant loadings from the evaluation of language learning environment dimension. Most of the variables were related to the evaluation of the English course with the exception of "English teacher style" loaded on this factor. These factor loadings were similar to the course evaluation in the socio-educational model (Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993b). However, this course evaluation factor also appeared independently in the foreign language learning contexts, as in Clement et al. (1994). Therefore, this was labeled as the course evaluation dimension.

3. Relationships between orientations and motivation factors

To find the relationships between orientations and motivations, correlations between orientation factors and motivation were conducted. Orientation factor scores were extracted from the previous factor analysis, while motivation constructs were calculated by standardizing and summing all variables corresponding to each motivation factor (Clement et al., 1994).

<Table 4-Correlations between Orientations and Motivations>

Factor	Integrative	Identification	Mot-Ext	Cog-Ext	Knowledge
Motivation(F1)	.296**		-.589**	.315**	.243**
Maladaptive(F3)		.239**		-.321**	.180*
Adaptive(F5)	.348**		-.280**		.434**
Teacher(F4)	.226**		-.325**		.193*
Course(F7)	.226**		-.388**		.259**

First of all, all orientation factors except identification were significantly correlated with motivation factor (F1). The significant correlation between integrative orientation and motivation (F1) supported the findings reported by Tremblay and Gardner (1995), that is, "integrative motive." However, formal classroom-related orientations, i.e., motivational extrinsic, cognitive extrinsic, and knowledge, were more significantly associated with motivation (F1). The negative correlation between motivational extrinsic orientation (preference for easy work and teacher approval) and motivation (F1) was the most significant among the relationships with Korean middle school students. The strong negative correlation indicates that the more extrinsically-orientated students were (in other words, the less curious and challengeable they are), the less they were likely to be motivated to study a foreign language. This finding implies that the more intrinsically oriented they are, the more they were likely to be motivated to study a foreign language.

The correlation between cognitive extrinsic orientation (i.e., external criteria for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

success/failure) and motivation (F1) was also significant. The positive correlation indicates that Korean middle school students were motivated to study a foreign language for the external criteria (i.e., teachers and school grades). These correlations between extrinsic orientations (both motivational and cognitive) and motivation (F1) indicate that extrinsic motivation explained more cognitive-based foreign language learning motivation than integrative/instrumental motivation did in the foreign language learning environments, at least with Korean middle school population. In other words, extrinsic motivations, whether motivational extrinsic (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval) or cognitive extrinsic (i.e., external criteria for success/failure), were more strongly related to cognitive-based motivation for EFL middle school students than integrative and knowledge-instrumental motivations were.

Maladaptive attributions were significantly, but negatively, correlated with cognitive extrinsic orientation (i.e., external criteria for suc/failure) with moderate influence from the knowledge orientation. That is, maladaptive attributions were directly related to external criteria for success/failure. The negative correlation between external criteria and maladaptive attributions indicates that students with external criteria were not likely to attribute their success/failure to luck, context, or ability. In other words, the more students have external criteria (i.e., teachers and school grades), the less they attribute their success or failure to uncontrollable causes, that is, the more they attribute their success/failure to controllable causes. It might be easier for young middle school students to control the causes of success/failure, based on the external criteria, rather than internal one.

On the other hand, adaptive attributions were significantly correlated with integrative and knowledge orientations, but negatively with motivational extrinsic orientation (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval). These orientations seemed to be associated with attributions of success/failure to internal aspects or controllability such as efforts and ability. The strong relationships between either knowledge or integrative orientation and adaptive attributions show that students, who were integratively (or knowledge) oriented, tended to attribute success/failure to internally controllable causes. This finding indicates that past experience of success/failure in knowledge purposes or interest in the target culture influenced their attributions of success/failure to internal or controllable causes (Weiner, 1985, 1986). The negative correlation between motivational extrinsic (preference for easy work and teacher approval) orientation and adaptive attributions indicates that the more curious and challengeable they are, the more they can control the causes of success/failure in foreign language learning. However, this correlation was relatively weak for those of the integrative and knowledge orientations.

As far as learning environment factors were concerned, both learning environment factors (F4 and F7) were significantly correlated with integrative and knowledge orientation factors, but negatively with motivational extrinsic orientation (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval). The relationships between integrative orientation and attitudes toward learning environments supported the existence of language learning attitude construct suggested by Tremblay and Gardner (1995). They combined two attitude-based constructs, integrativeness (i.e., integrative orientation) and language learning environments into language learning attitudes. However, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

correlation between motivational extrinsic orientation and learning environments, combined with knowledge orientation, was the most significant among the correlations. Therefore, classroom-related orientations were more strongly associated with LE factors with Korean middle school population. The negative correlation between motivational extrinsic orientation and learning environment factors (F4 and F7) indicates that the more they are extrinsically orientated (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval), the more negatively they evaluate their teachers and courses. In other words, the students, who were more intrinsically orientated (i.e., preference for challenging work and curiosity/interests), tended to evaluate their teachers and courses positively. In addition, the knowledge factor was related to formal classroom learning in the foreign language contexts (Clement et al., 1994). Therefore, classroom-related orientations (i.e., motivational extrinsic and knowledge), rather than integrative orientation, were more related to learning environment factor in foreign language learning motivation.

Overall, the extrinsic motivations (i.e., motivational and cognitive extrinsic orientations) were the most salient in the foreign language learning motivation. However, the motivational extrinsic orientation factor (i.e., preference for easy work and teacher approval) was the most significantly correlated, but negatively with all motivation factors. This indicates that students were extrinsically orientated (i.e., motivational extrinsic), but this negatively influenced motivation or vice-versa. Instead, students were motivated to study English for the external criteria (i.e., teachers and school grades).

On the other hand, LE factors were more associated with formal classroom-related orientations (i.e., motivational extrinsic and knowledge), rather than integrative orientation. This indicates the distinction between foreign language learning motivation and Gardner's socio-educational model. That is, the extrinsic orientations were more associated with cognitive-based motivation (F1) and language learning environment factors (F4 and F7) in the foreign language contexts. Finally, all orientations were significantly correlated with attributions, even though knowledge and integrative orientations were slightly more associated with them. Students' orientations seemed to be related to the locus of control (internal vs. external) and controllability (Weiner, 1985, 1986). Therefore, all orientations first should be internally controllable by/for students.

4. Gender Difference on Orientations and Motivations

To find out the gender difference of Korean middle school students in orientations and motivations, Discriminant function analysis and T-tests were conducted by using the factor scores extracted from the previous factor analyses. In addition T-tests were also performed on the indices of each construct, to see specific differences between males and females.

First, the analyses were conducted by entering all orientation factors into the discriminant analysis (Five orientation factors). The discriminant function in orientations indicated that there was a significant difference in gender (Wilks's Lambda: $p < .05$). The table of test of group equality showed that discriminant function resulted mainly from the integrative orientation factor (F1) between males and females. However, the classification table indicated that only 60.3% of the original group was correctly classified between males and females from this discriminant function.

Therefore, this discriminant function was not likely to effectively discriminate males and females in a reliable fashion.

<Table 5- Test of Equality of Group Means>

Factor	Wilks' Lambda	F-ratio	Significance
Integrative (F1)	.953	10.650/1	.001
Identification (F2)	.988	2.720/1	.101
Mot-Extrinsic (F3)	.991	1.971/1	.162
Cog-Extrinsic (F4)	.990	2.284/1	.132
Knowledge (F5)	.988	2.738/1	.099

<Table 6- Wilks' Lambda>

Test of Function	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-Square	DF	Sig.
1	.919	18.070	5	.003

Furthermore, t-test analysis confirmed that only the integrative orientation factor was significantly different between males and females ($p < .001$). That is, females were more integratively oriented than males for the study of English. More specific examples of integrative orientation (F1) were as follows: e.g., to know new people from different parts; to meet foreigners with whom I can speak English; to know the life of English-speaking nations; and so on.

As for motivation, the discriminant function analysis indicated that the discriminant function significantly discriminated between males and females (Wilks's Lambda. $P<.001$). However, the difference was mainly due to the language learning environments (Factor 4 and Factor 7) and adaptive attributions (F5).

<Table 7- Tests of Equality of Group Means>

Factor	Wilks' Lambda	F-ratio	Sig.
Motivation (F1)	1.000	.027/1	.871
Achievement (F2)	.999	.244/1	.622
Maladaptive Attributions(F3)	.999	.148/1	.701
Teacher Evaluation(F4)	.897	24.907/1	.000
Adaptive Attributions(F5)	.982	3.902/1	.050
Orientation (F6)	.985	3.237/1	.073
Course Evaluation(F7)	.975	5.674/1	.018

Note: 65.8% of original grouped cases correctly classified.

<Table 8- Wilks' Lambda>

Test of Function	Wilks' Lambda	Chi-Square	DF	Sig.
1	.855	33.408	7	.000

The above table 7 indicates that Factor 4 and 7 were significantly different between males and females. In addition the adaptive attributions also moderately discriminated males from females. The classification result showed that 65.8% of original grouped cases were correctly classified. It seemed that the discriminant function discriminated males from females more effectively than that in the previous analyses.

T-tests also indicated the significant difference in the learning environment factor (Factor 4 and Factor 7): $p<.001$ and $p<.05$. In other words, female students reported more positive attitudes towards language learning environments than male students. In addition females reported higher scores in adaptive attributions than males: $p= .05$. That is, females attributed their success/failure

of language learning to (internally) controllable causes (i.e., effort and ability) more than males. In addition the comparison by way of summing each variable indicated that females reported higher scores on all aspects of language learning environments as well as adaptive attributions than males. Therefore, females were more integratively-orientated than males and further they show positive attitudes towards language learning environments as reflected in teacher evaluation and course evaluation. These two areas were related to language attitude in Tremblay and Gardner (1995). However, there was no difference in language learning motivation between males and females during the middle school years.

IV. Summary/Conclusion

In summary, the integrative orientation factor (F1) was the most influential one among other orientations with Korean middle school students. This factor explained the highest variance of students' orientations. In addition, the instrumental orientation factor appears, but this factor was overlapped with strong knowledge orientation with Korean middle school students (Factor 5). That is, school-subject related knowledge orientation seemed to be salient with this population. Instrumental orientation seemed to be relatively weak with this population, considering the instrumental-knowledge orientation factor found in Clement et al.'s (1994) high school students. The knowledge factor seemed to be influential, combined with the extrinsic orientations (F3 and F4), in the formal classroom language learning environments.

The special interests in the factor loadings were the emergence of the extrinsic orientations. Korean middle school students were extrinsically orientated to study English, (i.e., preference for easy work, teacher approval, and external criteria for success/failure, e.g., school grades or teachers). In addition the distinctions between motivational and cognitive extrinsic orientations were made through factor analysis, as in Harter's (1981) higher order factor analysis. The items related to preference for easy work and teacher approval were concerned about the motivational components of the extrinsic orientation (F3), while the external criteria for success/failure was related to the cognitive-informational components of the extrinsic orientation (F4). Therefore, extrinsic orientations seemed to be an important factor for studying English with Korean middle school population.

On the other hand, this study confirmed several findings in foreign language motivations from previous studies. First of all, this study showed that motivation was not a single construct like Gardner's "integrative motive" factor, but a multi-factor construct which was composed of several sub-components, depending on the language learning contexts (Bardwell & Braaksma, 1984; Schmidt et al., 1996). The sub-constructs of motivation (F1) supported the recent arguments for the expansion of the socio-educational model to include the new cognitive/affective constructs in the formal classroom EFL learning (Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Schmidt et al., 1996; Crookes & Schmidt, 1991). Korean middle school students' motivation (F1) was similar to Tremblay and Gardner's (1995) motivation in terms of new cognitive aspects of the components. The factor loadings of goal salience, valence, and motivated behavior to this factor supported these arguments.

However, the factor loadings of extrinsic orientations (either motivational or cognitive) and

the "need for achievement" to motivation indicate the different aspects of foreign language learning motivation from the second language learning motivation proposed by Gardner and his associates. Basically, the soci-educational model was defined as integrative motive, i.e., integrative orientation or attitudes plus motivation. However, the classroom-oriented factors such as extrinsic orientations and need for achievement were loaded to this factor instead. Dornyei (1990a) found that need for achievement and instrumental orientation/motivation were associated with each other, and that these two factors affect motivation in the foreign language contexts. This finding was partially confirmed with Korean middle school population. However, need for achievement and extrinsic orientation were combined with motivation rather than instrumental orientation in this study. This might be due to the sample subject differences: adults vs. middle school population.

As Gardner (1985b) mentioned, students should be motivated to study a second language. Orientations were no more than reasons for studying a second language without motivation or motivated behavior. Even though integrative orientation explained the highest variance of students' orientations, extrinsic orientations (either motivational or cognitive) were mainly related to cognitive-based motivation (F1) and further the sub-components of motivation(F1) (see Kang, 1999). That is, young middle school students were extrinsically motivated to study English.

Furthermore, the motivational extrinsic orientation factor was more strongly associated with LE factors. These were all related to classroom language learning motivation. In foreign language learning motivation, the extrinsic motivation seemed to be the most influential among them. However, motivational extrinsic orientation was negatively correlated with motivation (F1), while cognitive extrinsic orientation, positively with motivation (F1). Therefore, students' motivational extrinsic orientations negatively influenced motivation or vice versa, while their motivations seemed to be dependent on the cognitive extrinsic orientation (i.e., the external criteria for success/failure) during the middle school years. In addition the negative relationship between motivational extrinsic orientation and motivation (F1) indicates that intrinsically orientated students (i.e., preference for challenging work and curiosity/interests) were more likely to be motivated to study a foreign language.

The emergence of adaptive/maladaptive attributions also indicates the importance of internal/external causalities or controllability, as Weiner (1985) suggested (Schmidt et al., 1996; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Adaptive and maladaptive attributions were similar to the "determination" and "beliefs about failure" found in Schmidt et al. (1996). The distinction between the above two factors in Schmidt et al. (1996) was based on the dimension of internal/external causalities, while the distinction between adaptive and maladaptive attributions in this study was defined in terms of the dimension of controllability, following Tremblay and Gardner (1995) (see Weiner, 1985, 1986).

On the other hand, previous researchers also found "bad learning experience" and helplessness in the foreign language contexts, which were similar to maladaptive attributions in this study (Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989). Dornyei (1990a) claimed that attributions about past failure could be expected to affect motivation, because "learning failure" was a very common phenomena in foreign language learning contexts. The current study showed that maladaptive attributions

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

explained higher variance of motivation than adaptive attributions. This finding indicates that maladaptive attributions could be more salient in this context (Julkunen, 1989; Dornyei, 1990a). However, Schmidt et al. (1996) found that the attributions of success/failure to internal causes were combined with motivation, and further explained the highest variance of motivation, while attributions of failure to external causes, "beliefs about failure," explained a small amount of variance. This might be due to the fact that Schmidt et al. (1996) found the results with students who voluntarily enrolled in the private ESL institute, while regular school population took part in the other research (Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989). Therefore, foreign language learning first should be controllable (internally) by/for students before leading to motivations, or vice versa.

In addition all orientation factors were significantly correlated with attributions. That is, students' orientations seemed to be related to Weiner's (1985, 1986) causal dimensions: locus of control (internal vs. external) and controllability. Previous research showed that attributions of success/failure to internally controllable causes were strongly associated with motivation, while attributions to externally uncontrollable causes could lead to helplessness (Schmidt et al., 1996; Dornyei, 1990a; Julkunen, 1989; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). Therefore, students' orientations first should be internally controllable by/for students in the classroom.

Finally, the emergence of language learning environment factors supported the previous findings (Gardner, 1985b; Gardner & MacIntyre, 1993b; Clement et al., 1994). These LE factors seemed to be influential with both second and foreign language learners, because both were related to classroom language learning. However, the teacher evaluation factor explained the variance of motivation more than the course evaluation factor with Korean middle school population. This indicates that young middle school students might be more influenced by the teachers rather than the course.

V. Educational Implications

The Korean school population reported several orientations including extrinsic orientations as well as integrative and instrumental ones. Students' orientations, whether those were associated with motivation or not, could be very important for educational purposes (Oxford & Shearin, 1994). This study also indicated that extrinsic motivations significantly explained the foreign language learning motivation negatively in the formal classroom contexts. It has been reported that extrinsic motivation tends to undermine intrinsic motivation for interesting tasks and to impede the internalization of regulations for uninteresting tasks (Deci et al., 1991; Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994).

Deci and his associates argued that the shift from extrinsic motivation to intrinsic motivation can be achieved by satisfying three basic psychological needs: need for competence, relatedness, and autonomy (or self-determination) (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1990; Deci et al., 1991). Researchers have suggested several useful approaches for enhancing students' intrinsic motivation in the foreign language learning literature (Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994). The first basic condition, need for competence, was related to self-efficacy or self-confidence. Oxford and Shearin (1994) argued that attributions of past accomplishment could play an important role in developing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

self-efficacy (see Dornyei, 1990a). They further argued that once a strong sense of self-efficacy/self-confidence can be developed, a failure may not have much impact. Foreign language teachers, therefore, should help students develop the initial self-efficacy by matching difficulty of tasks with students' ability (Dornyei, 1994a), providing meaningful, achievable, and success-engendering language tasks (Oxford & Shearin, 1994), and in turn increasing experience with success (Keller, 1983). For example, foreign language teachers might ask students what they can do or what they cannot do in L2. L2 teachers can promote students' self-confidence or self-efficacy by emphasizing what they can do in L2 (Dornyei, 1994a). In addition L2 teachers can provide students with useful techniques, e.g., language learning strategies, when students do the specific tasks. Whenever they are successful in L2 tasks, L2 teachers can provide positive feedback for students, which could result in a strong sense of self-efficacy.

The second condition, relatedness, for enhancing intrinsic motivation, involves "developing secure and satisfying connections with others in one's social milieu" (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1990; Deci et al., 1991; see Keller, 1983). Keller (1983) argued that important personal needs were met by the learning situations to increase motivation (see McClelland, 1953; Maslow, 1954). He suggested that instructors should provide opportunities for no-risk cooperative interaction which was a prerequisite to more challenging risk-taking activities (see Maslow, 1954). In addition several researchers in L2 recommended that foreign language teachers should adopt the role of a facilitator rather than an authority figure in the classroom, thus increasing students' intrinsic motivation (Dornyei, 1994a; Oxford & Shearin, 1994; Brown, 1991).

The third basic need, autonomy, refers to "being self-initiating and self-regulating of one's actions" (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 1991; Deci et al., 1991). Ames (1992) suggested that instructors should provide students with more opportunities in decision making, but that students' choice be guided by interest, not by an intent to minimize effort or avoid failure (see Keller, 1983; Ryan et al., 1985). Furthermore, Ames argued that instructors guide students for selecting, planning, and applying appropriate strategies to shift the locus of responsibility from the teacher to the students. The specific methods to satisfy autonomy/self-determination in L2 motivation were also suggested by Dornyei (1994a) as follows: (1) foreign language teachers make the syllabus of the course relevant by basing it on needs analysis and involving the students in the actual planning of the course program; (2) discuss with students the choice of teaching materials for the course; (3) promote learner autonomy by allowing real choices about alternative ways to goal attainment, minimizing external pressure and control (pp. 281-283).

On the other hand, the strong impact of the integrative orientation suggests that language teachers should include a socio-cultural component in the L2 syllabus by sharing positive L2-related experiences in class, showing films or T.V. recordings, playing, relevant music, and inviting interesting native speaking guests (Dornyei, 1994a). This could help students meet their integrative orientation (e.g., English-media) and further continue their interests and curiosity in the target language (i.e., intrinsic orientation). Korean middle school population would like to make friendships with a target language community in the indirect ways. Therefore, language teachers should encourage students to make contact with L2 speakers by arranging meetings with L2 speakers in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

class; or finding pen-friends for students (Dornyei, 1994a, pp. 281-283).

The approach above has emphasized the role of socio-cultural components of "communicative competence" in foreign language learning literature (Hymes, 1972; Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia et al., 1995; MacIntyre et al., 1998). A number of studies reported that students have shown a positive attitude toward required language study, especially if the socio-cultural component was emphasized (Morello, 1988; Bacon & Finneman, 1990; Roberts, 1992). Therefore, integration of language and culture could function as a positive attitude and further motivation to study a foreign language (Gardner, 1985b). Many foreign language educators have claimed that culture study should be incorporated into the foreign language learning (Brooks, 1968, 1971; Morain, 1983; Kramsch, 1983; Seelye, 1993; Arries, 1994). Several traditional "activity" approach has been suggested such as "culture capsule," "culture assimilator," "culture cluster," mini-drama, field trips, visits by native speakers, and utilizing authentic materials (Taylor & Sorenson, 1961; Meade & Morain, 1973; Fiedler, et al., 1971; Morain, 1979, 1983; Kalivoda, et al., 1971; Seelye, 1993). These traditional techniques showed how the cultural components could be incorporated into the language learning activities (Kang, 1999).

However, foreign language teachers should develop students' cross-cultural awareness systematically rather than simply adopting the socio-cultural components to satisfy students' integrative orientation (Dornyei, 1994a). More recently, the "anthropology process" approach suggested taking into account of both the process itself and the problems that may arise (Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Kramsch, 1983; Arries, 1994). The culture unit plans suggested by these researchers can be easily incorporated into Korean foreign language classroom by foreign language teachers (see Mantle-Bromley, 1992; Arries, 1994).

On the other hand, all orientations were relatively equally associated with attributions in this study. Students' attributions were related to either locus of control (i.e., internal vs. external causalities), or controllability (Weiner, 1985, 1986). This study showed that adaptive attributions (e.g., attributions of success/failure to internally controllable causes) were positively correlated with motivation or achievement, while maladaptive attributions (e.g., attributions of success/failure to externally uncontrollable causes), negatively with them. Therefore, students' orientations first appear to be internally controllable by/for them before leading to motivation and further achievement. According to the attributional model (Weiner et al., 1971; Weiner, 1985, 1986), it would be especially important to make internal attributions (ability and effort) after success, whereas unstable causes (bad luck or lack of effort) would appear to be most desirable following failure (see Forsterling, 1985). On the other hand, Forsterling's (1985) review showed that "learned helplessness" was concerned about the controllability (Maier & Seligman, 1976; Seligman, 1975; Schunk, 1991). Therefore, Dweck (1975) has claimed that helpless individuals should be trained to attribute success and failure to effort (an internally controllable factor). Because Korean school students were likely to attribute their success/failure to uncontrollable causes (e.g., ability and context), language teachers should help students to attribute their failures to an internal, unstable, and a controllable attribute (e.g., lack of effort and the use of inappropriate strategies) rather than lack of ability (Dornyei, 1994a).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

<References>

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(3), 261-271.

Arries, F. Jonathan. (1994). Constructing culture study units: A blueprint and practical tools. Foreign Language Annals, 27, 523-534.

Au, S. Y. (1988). A critical appraisal of Gardner's social-psychological theory of second-language (L2) learning. Language Learning, 38, 75-100.

Bachman, L. F. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bacon, S. M. & Finnemann, M. D. (1990). A study of the attitudes, motives, and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input. Modern Language Journal, 74(iv), 459-473.

Bagnole, J. W. (1993). The magic and mystery of motivation in TEFL and language learning. TESOL Matters (Februrary/March, 10).

Bandura, A. & Shunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41, 586-598.

Bardwell, R. & Braaksma, E. F. (1983). Motivation as multifactor trait. Journal of Psychology, 119(1), 5-14.

Brooks, Nelson. (1968). Teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. Foreign Language Annals, 1, 204-217.

Brooks, Nelson. (1971). A guest editorial: Culture-a new frontier. Foreign Language Annals, 5, 54-61.

Brown, H. D. (1991). TESOL at Twenty-Five: What are the issues? TESOL Quarterly, 25(2), 245-260.

Canale, M. & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1, 245-276.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6, 5-35.

Clement, R. (1980). Ethnicity, contact, and communicative competence in a second language. In H. Giles, W. P. Robinson, & P. M. Smith (Eds.), Language: Social Psychological Perspectives (pp. 147-154). Oxford, United Kingdom: Pergamon Press.

Clement, R. (1986). Second language proficiency and acculturation: An investigation of the effects of language status and individual characteristics. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5(4), 271-290.

Clement, R., Dornyei, Z., & Noels, A. K. (1994). Motivation, self-confidence, and group cohesion in the foreign language classroom. Language Learning, 44(3), 417-448.

Clement, R. & Kruidenier, B. G. (1983). Orientations in second language acquisition: I. The effects of ethnicity, milieu, and target language on their emergence. Language Learning, 33, 273-291.

Clement, R. & Kruidenier, B. G. (1985). Aptitude, attitude and motivation in second language proficiency: A test of Clement's model. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 4, 21-37.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Crookes, G. & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. Language Learning, 41(4), 469-512.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. & Rathunde, K. (1992). The measurement of flow in everyday life: Toward a theory of emergent motivation. In R. Dienstbier & Janis. E. Jacobs (Eds.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 40, Developmental perspectives on motivation (pp. 57-97). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York: Plenum.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1990). A motivational approach to self: Integration in personality. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation: Vol. 38, Perspectives on motivation (pp. 237-288). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Deci, E. L., Vallerand, R. J., Pelletrier, L. G., & Ryan, R. M. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. Educational Psychology, 26, 325-346.

Dornyei, Z. (1990). Conceptualizing Motivation in Foreign-Language Learning. Language Learning, 40, 45-78.

Dornyei, Z. (1994a). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. Modern Language Journal, 78(iii), 273-284.

Dornyei, Z. (1994b). Understanding L2 motivation: On with the challenge! Modern Language Journal, 78(iv), 515-523.

Dweck, C. S. (1975). The role of expectations and attributions in the alleviation of learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 674-685.

Forsterling, Friedrich. (1985). Attributional retraining: A review. Psychological Bulletin, 98(3), 495-512.

Gardner, R. C. (1980). On the validity of affective variables in second language acquisition: Conceptual, contextual, and statistical considerations. Language Learning, 30, 255-270.

Gardner, R. C. (1985a). Motivation questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript.

Gardner, R. C. (1985b). Social psychology and second language learning: The role of attitudes and motivation. London, Canada: Edward Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, R. N. (1959). Motivation variables in second language acquisition. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 13, 266-272.

Gardner, R. C. & Lambert, W. (1972). Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1992). A student's contribution to second language learning. Part I: Cognitive variables. Language Teaching, 25, 211-220.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993a). On the measurement of affective variables in second language learning. Language Learning, 43(2), 157-194.

Gardner, R. C. & MacIntyre, P. D. (1993b). A student's contributions to second-language learning. Part II: Affective variables. Language Teaching, 26, 1-11.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994a). On motivation, research agendas, and theoretical frameworks. Modern Language Journal, 78(iii), 359-368.

Gardner, R. C. & Tremblay, P. F. (1994b). On motivation: Measurement and conceptual considerations. Modern Language Journal, 78(iv), 424-527.

Harter, Susan. (1981). A new self-report scale of intrinsic versus extrinsic orientation in the classroom: Motivational and informational components. Developmental Psychology, 17(3), 300-312.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin.

Julkunen, K. (1989). Situation- and task-specific motivation in foreign-language learning and teaching (Publication in Education No. 6). Joensuu, Finland: University of Joensuu.

Kalivoda, B. T., Morain, G., & Elkins, J. R. (1971). The auto-motor unit: A listening comprehension strategy that works. Foreign Language Annals, 4, 393-400.

Kang, D. H. (1999). Motivation and its change in foreign language context. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Keller, J. M. (1983). Motivational design of instruction. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), Instructional design theories and models (pp. 386-433). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

MacIntyre, D. P. & Gardner, R. C. (1994a). The subtle effects of language anxiety on cognitive processing in the second language. Language Learning, 44, 283-305.

Maslow, A. H. (1954, 1970). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

Meade, B. & Morain, G. (1973). The culture cluster. Foreign Language Annals, 6, 31-38.

Morain, G. (1979). The cultoon. Canadian Modern Language Review, 35, 676-690.

Morain, G. (1983). Commitment to the teaching of foreign cultures. Modern Language Journal, 67(iv), 403-412.

Muchnick, A. G. & Wolfe, D. E. (1982). Attitudes and motivations of American students of Spanish. Canadian Modern Language Review, 38, 262-281.

Omaggio-Hadley, Alice. (1993). Teaching language in context. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, R. & Shearin, J. (1994). Language learning motivation: Expanding the theoretical framework. Modern Language Journal, 78(i), 12-28.

Roberts, L. P. (1992). Attitudes of entering university freshmen toward foreign language study: A descriptive analysis. Modern Language Journal, 76(iii), 275-283.

Schmidt, Richard., Borai, Deena., & Kassabgy, Omneya. (1996). Foreign language motivation: Internal structure and external connections. In R. Oxford (Ed.), Language Learning Motivation: Pathways to the New Century (Vol. 11, pp. 9-70). Honolulu: University of Hawai, Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. Educational Psychologist, 26(3), 207-231.

Seelye, H. N (1993). Teaching culture: Strategies for intercultural communication. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco: Freeman.

Skehan, P. (1989). Individual differences in second language learning. London: Edward Arnold.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using multivariate statistics. California State University, Northridge: Harper Collins College Publishers.

Tremblay, P. F. & Gardner, R. C. (1995). Expanding the motivation construct in language learning. Modern Language Journal, 79(iv), 505-518.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92(4), 548-573.

Weiner, B. (1986). An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. New York:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Springer-Verlag.

Wong, Maria. Mei-ha., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1991). Motivation and academic achievement: The effects of personality traits and the quality of experience. Journal of Personality, 59(3), 539-574.